DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 697 HE 026 352

AUTHOR Mauch, James E.; And Others
TITLE Emeritus Rank in Major Research Universities: Retiree Perquisites and Privileges.
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); *Aging in Academia; *Faculty College Relationship; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; Personnel Policy; Research; Research Universities; *Retirement Benefits; *School Policy; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Emeritus Professors

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes rights and privileges provided to faculty retirees and emeriti of research universities, and presents results from a questionnaire sent to American Association of Universities (AAU) institutions (46 of the 60 members responded) concerning their ranking in desirability of 48 privileges, services, opportunities, rights, and eligibilities extended to retired faculty. Results indicate that there were no broadly and strongly held views about the appropriateness of any of the 48 rights and privileges under consideration whether they were considered for emeriti only or faculty retirees as a group. No single set of rights or privileges turned out to be overwhelming favorites. In addition, various policies regarding retirees and their rights and privileges were asked on the questionnaire, and these results are also discussed. They indicate that, in the AAU institutions, there seems to be a modest advantage to having emeritus status. The results show no institution being committed to any one position on the issue of retirement. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356697

EMERITUS RANK IN MAJOR RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: RETIREE PERQUISITES AND PRIVILEGES

James E. Mauch
Jack W. Birch
Jack Matthews

University of Pittsburgh

With the imminent demise of compulsory retirement there is increasing interest in the continuing relationships between retired professors and their universities. This paper is a report of the rights, opportunities and eligibilities that are extended by members of the American Association of Universities (AAU) to retired and emeritus faculty.

Recently Albert (1986) proposed 39 rights and privileges institutions ought to consider granting to emeriti. The initial basis for credibility for Albert's list was its approval in principle in 1981 by the Academic Senate of the California State University System. Five years later, in 1986, the list won unanimous approval from the Second West Coast Conference on Retirement in Colleges and Universities. More recently, the AAUP (1988) endorsed a selected group of perquisites for emeriti, all of which appear in Albert's 1986 publication.

Albert dubbed his list a "Bill of Rights for Emeriti." It was intended to help establish standards for future retirement policies of colleges and universities in respect to what continuing relationships ought to be fostered after formal employment is concluded. Each item speaks to some explicit or implicit interaction between the emeritus faculty member and some aspect of the university community. Albert observed that the statements in the list were exerting ". . . a salutary influence on those university communities familiar with it." (1986, p. 24). Because Albert's article appeared in *ACADEME* it seems fair to assume that, by now, administrators and faculty at universities nationwide have had opportunity to become familiar with its contents.

A review of publications in higher education since 1986 shows occasional references to perquisites associated with the move to emeritus status (Mauch, Birch & Matthews 1990). However, we found no empirical studies of what rights or privileges are actually provided to emeriti, nor any assessments of trends or viewpoints of persons in decision-influencing roles.

HE026352

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES E. MAUCH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That situation, coupled with the recent growth of interest in changes that might be associated with the un-capping of age of compulsory retirement, encouraged us to look into the incidence and prevalence of the items in Albert's 1986 list in current university policies and practices.

With Albert's encouragement, in 1989 we undertook an investigation to determine , first, to what extent the awarding of special rights and privileges for emeriti had become institutionalized in higher education. A second goal was to ascertain which rights and privileges were considered by administration to be most desirable for the institution and its retired faculty and which were considered least desirable. Third, we planned to examine the policy implications of the findings.

Five questions were posed regarding the rights and privileges provided to retirees and emeriti. They are:

1. Which rights and privileges are most frequently provided?

2. Can university policies be inferred, based on commonalities among clusters of retiree perquisites?

3. Are there differences in the awarding of rights and privileges between retirees in general and those retirees who attain emeritus faculty status?

4. Among major research universities, are there notable differences in the degree to which they offer retiree perquisites and privileges?

5. What perquisites, services and eligibilities do the administrators of major research universities consider most desirable and least desirable for their institutions and their retired faculty?

It was not feasible to contact all higher education institutions for the information about their practices. Instead a decision was made to begin the data collection from two discrete populations. The first population consisted of members of the American Association of Universities (AAU). Seventy-eight percent of the AAU institutions (47 of the 60 members) responded and provided usable data. The findings from that population are reported here. The second population, to be reported on in a later paper, comprised all of the degree- granting institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a much more varied population with regard to size and mission than the AAU.

Albert (1986) grouped rights and privileges into three categories, namely: For All Emeriti; For Emeriti Wishing to Continue Teaching, Scholarly, or Other Academic Activity; and For Organized Emeriti Activities. Sometimes Albert would include in one statement of a right or privilege a diverse group of facilities or services (i.e., Access to laboratory, secretarial, computer, department stationary, etc.). To elicit more specific responses, we recast such statements into the form of several individual questions. In consequence, our list contains 48 items while remaining substantively the same and readily comparable to the 39 items on Albert's list.

The directions for responding to our questionnaire were these:

1. Not at this college or university.

2. Yes, this applies to all our retired faculty.

3. Yes, but informally on an individual basis.

4. Yes, but applies only to those retired faculty with emeritus status.

5. N/A -Not applicable here (e.g." We have no faculty club.")

Answers to the first two questions posed earlier are presented together in what follows. Then the three remaining questions are taken up in sequence.

The three groups of rights or privileges proposed by Albert (1986) are quite appropriate if one wishes to show the kinds of perquisites desired by faculty. It was our wish to try to put those same rights and privileges into groupings that would reflect, instead, the operation of one or more institutional policies. Thus, one might read a certain institutional policy and conclude that from that policy might flow specific practices in the form of rights and privileges awarded to retired or emeritus faculty. In short, we proposed to examine the "Bill of Rights for Emeriti" to see if we could discern groupings that would seem to express particular policies in action, policies that we might then be able to state.

The inquiry that was sent to the higher education institutions included a request for statements or comments on their practices and policies regarding ways found effective for relating to retirees and emeriti as they anticipated leaving and after they had left. In many instances the respondents included hand-written remarks, explanations and suggestions.

Those proved quite helpful by adding meaning to the objective check-marks on the response sheet.

It was hoped that some colleges and universities might send us printed material in which could be found useful models. It is not clear why, but the response of that kind was very limited. None of the publications received contained information about university policies regarding either immediate or longer-range institutional relationships with faculty who had or were about to retire.

We therefore decided to apply an inductive process in an effort to draw out of the practices of the institutions some notion of what general policies might be at play, implicitly or explicitly. Comparing item to item in Albert's list it was possible to see that some items were closely related to each other while being quite unrelated to other items. Those items that seemed to aggregate naturally and without conflict were then examined to ascertain if, together, they expressed a larger principle or policy. We termed this procedure *Rational Cluster Analysis*. This approach allows the policies behind specific practices to be inferred. The rationale is that a practice can be a defining event for policy. For example, let us say that an institution provides retirement information to all faculty. That, then, is a practice of the institution. Let us say, also, that pre-retirement counseling is provided to faculty. That, too, is an institutional practice. If it is found that, in addition, the institution supplies post- retirement counsel to faculty on request we can say there are three practices that are linked to informing and counseling. We can infer that the institution has a policy, either explicit or implicit, to give counseling to retirees. What the institution really does, in actuality, is what forms the content and the defining events of the policy.

To carry the illustration of the cluster formation and analysis procedure further, suppose one finds that there is a practice of listing retired faculty in faculty and staff directories. That begins to suggest that another and different policy is at work. Examination of additional practices of a similar type could lead to the determination that there is a policy of recognizing the continuing membership of retirees in the academic/professional faculty.

After applying such a rational cluster analysis it was possible to identify policies that seemed to be at work, at least tacitly, in determining what perquisites were linked to retirement and/or emeritus status.

The information supplied by the AAU respondents is presented under seven headings. The headings are called, in this report, policies. That is, the group of rights or privileges listed under a particular one of the seven

policy headings can be thought of as a cluster of institutional behaviors that express and implement the general principle set forth in the policy statement. Also, whenever the term "retiree" is used, it refers not to all retired employees, but solely to persons who retired when holding faculty rank.

The specific prerogatives offered to retirees by their universities are, as noted earlier, grouped under the general policies they would define or exemplify. Within groups, they are ranked, highest to lowest, according to the percentage of AAU institutions that provide the privileges or services to all faculty retirees, with the highest percentage first. In cases of ties, the percentage figures under the "Yes, informally." column are used to break ties.

Each numbered item under a policy is preceded by two percentage numbers. The first indicates the percentage of respondents who indicated "Yes, this applies to all our retired faculty." The second percentage indicates the proportion of respondents who indicated "Yes, but applies only to those retired faculty with emeritus status."[1]

POLICY I. Retirement counseling, information, and health and life insurance benefits are due each retiree. Personal and financial advisement shall be available during the period prior to retirement and after retirement, with respect to retirement benefits.

1. (85-00) Pre-retirment information is provided for faculty.

2. (62-00) Pre-retirement counseling is provided.

3. (49-04) Health insurance continues, paid in whole or part by the institution.

4. (34-02) Life insurance continues, paid in whole or part by the institution.

5. (32-00) Post-retirement counseling is provided.

POLICY II. Retirees are encouraged to participate in campus social, organizational and recreational life. This includes access and opportunities to continue taking part in those events available prior to transfer to retirement status, plus added social, organizational and recreational activities that arise after retirement.

1. (81-09) Social and recreational facilities may be used.

2. (77-09) Cultural events may be attended under the same conditions as regular faculty.

3. (75-09) Athletic events may be attended under the same conditions as regular faculty.

4. (70-02) There is access to college or alumni travel services.

5. (68-04) Credit union activities are available.

6. (64-13) Retirees remain on mailing lists, if desired.

7. (55-13) Campus publications and notices are sent.

8. (47-13) Faculty dining privileges are continued.

9. (47-06) Faculty club membership is available.

10. (32-09) Faculty discounts are given at the bookstore.

POLICY III. Retirees are made welcome as continuing members of the general campus academic/professional community.

1. (72-09) ID cards (or equivalent) are issued.

2. (38-21) Invitations to campus functions are sent, as in the case of regular faculty.

3. (34-40) Retirees are listed in faculty directories.

4. (26-06) Names may be listed in the campus roster.

5. (26-21) Invitations are sent to participate in commencement exercises.

6. (20-09) Retirees are regularly invited to participate in seminars, colloquia, lectures, and other scholarly meetings.

7. (19-38) Retirees are listed in college catalogues.

POLICY IV. Retirees are encouraged by their departments and schools to maintain a continued and voluntary involvement in their current academic/professional activities and affairs. Departmental and school amenities and courtesies similar to those afforded regular full-time faculty

should be furnished when justified by retiree needs and participation.

1. (77-15) Retirees have regular library privileges.

2. (64-06) Academic courses may be audited.

3. (51-26) Regular faculty parking privileges are provided.

4. (32-30) Retirees may have a campus address and use regular faculty mail privileges.

5. (30-06) Departmental office space is available.

6. (28-13) Retirees may serve in a variety of advisory and consultant roles on campus.

7. (17-15) Retirees are invited to attend faculty meetings.

8. (15-04) Retirees may represent the institution on department, school, campus or state committees.

9. (15-13) Retirees serve on departmental committees.

10. (11-32) Departmental telephone use is available.

POLICY V. Inducements and support are given to retirees to continue to teach and advise students part-time.

1. (30-06) Opportunities are offered to teach, as needed.

2. (23-17) Retirees are eligible to serve on committees for theses and dissertations.

3. (21-23) Usual faculty mailing privileges are available.

4. (06-28) Secretarial service is available.

5. (06-00) Retirees are given preference for part-time teaching jobs.

POLICY VI. Continuation of research and scholarly activity by retirees is favored and fostered.

1. (34-17) Grants, contracts, awards and other funds for research and scholarly work may be received.

2. (28-15) There is eligibility to receive institutional support for grant proposals submitted to funding agencies.

3. (26-21) Opportunities are provided to pursue unfunded research and scholarly projects in the retiree's field, using institutional facilities.

4. (15-05) Help is available with the costs of producing scholarly publications, including page and permission fees.

5. (11-28) Retirees may use computers, word processors, laboratories, instruments, supplies, observations and the like necessary to their continued research and scholarly work.

6. (09-04) There is eligibility for funds for help in defraying travel costs for presentations at professional meetings.

POLICY VII. Campus facilities are made available for organizations of retirees to meet and to establish a presence in the institution.

1. (40-02) The retirees association has representation on senate and faculty councils.

2. (32-06) Retirees have an established association here.

3. (09-00) There is a retiree center on campus.

4. (09-00) A retiree association may use campus meeting rooms.

Seven rather distinctive aspects of retirement policy in AAU schools have been identified. Also inspection shows that 13 of the 48 items in our list are offered to retirees by more that 50% of the respondents.

The third question posed in this investigation was as follows:

3. Are there differences in the awarding of rights and privileges between retirees in general and those retirees who attain emeritus faculty status?

In the AAU institutions there seems to be a modest advantage to having emeritus status at the academic and professional and the departmental and school levels (see Policy III, items 3 and 7, and Policy IV,

item 10, and Policy V, items 2 and 4). That emeriti are more likely to be named in school directories and twice as likely to be listed in college catalogues than are faculty retirees in general may mean much or little, depending upon what the individual values. The remaining three items in which emeriti are favored--the use of a telephone, faculty mailing privileges, and secretarial services--seem much more substantive with respect to utility in pursuing one's pre-retirement interests.

The fourth question addressed in this study dealt with differences from university to university in the extent to which they provide certain rights and services to faculty who have retired. The question was:

4. Among major research universities, are there notable differences in the degree to which they offer retiree perquisites and privileges?

In our AAU sample there were a number of substantial differences in both the degree and the manner in which institutions offer retiree perquisites and privileges. These findings are based on tabulations from the 46 institutions which marked responses to our questions about the list of 48 retiree rights and benefits and indicated "Yes, for all" or "Yes, emeritus only." It is true, also, that a number of universities noted that some of the perquisites were made available to retirees "informally," but we reported only uniform practices for all retirees or emeriti.

First, Albert's (1986) original list of desirable retiree perquisites received further validation of a substantive kind. Every one of the rights and privileges named in his paper actually is awarded by at least some of the schools we queried.

Second it is clear that there is a great range among the AAU members in the extent to which they award perquisites to retirees. For example, 10 percent gave 14 or fewer. At the other extreme 10 percent provided 34 or more. The full range was from 10 to 42.

Fifty-nine percent of our sample of research universities (AAU) did make a distinction between faculty retirees in general and those retirees given emeritus status by awarding additional rights and privileges to the latter. The typical emeritus professor at one of those schools retired with six more perquisites than faculty members who retired without the emeritus rank.

However, in the entire sample of 46 respondents to this part of our questionnaire we saw no significant correlation, positive or negative,

between the number of perquisites an institution provided for all faculty and for emeritus rank faculty only. In other words, if only a few perquisites were offered by a given university to all faculty, that was no predictor of whether a few or a great many perquisites might be extended to those with emeritus status at the same school. The reverse was also true. A substantial number of perquisites for all retired faculty did not signify whether a few or many additional ones might be reserved for faculty retirees with emeritus status. For example, one university awarded 20 rights and privileges to all retired faculty and 20 more to those with emeritus rank, while another school also gave 20 rights and privileges to all retired faculty but gave no more to those with emeritus standing.

The fifth question posed in this study is as follows:

5. What perquisites, services and eligibilities do the administrators of major research universities consider most desirable and least desirable for their own institutions and for their faculties?

Representatives of the AAU institutions who responded to our questionnaire were asked to look over the list of 48 privileges, services, opportunities, rights and eligibilities sometimes extended to retired faculty. They were asked to select those three they considered most desirable for their institution and its retired faculty, whether currently offered or not. In the same manner they were directed to indicate the three they considered least desirable.

Interestingly, none turned out to be overwhelming favorites. The top preferences are listed below, with the percent of respondents voting for each given in the parenthesis.

First Most Desirable:

1. (17) Pre-retirement information is provided to faculty.
2. (15) Pre-retirement counseling is provided to faculty.
3. (15) Retired faculty retain health insurance paid in full or part by the institution.

Second Most Desirable:

1. (09) Retired faculty may receive and administer grants, contracts, awards and other funds for research and scholarly

work.

2. (09) Retired faculty retain life insurance paid in full or part by the institution.

Third Most Desirable:

1. (13) Pre-retirement information is provided to faculty.

2. (11) Retired faculty may receive and administer grants, contracts, awards and other funds for research and scholarly work.

3. (06) Retired faculty are offered opportunities to teach as needed.

First Least Desirable:

1. (11) Retired faculty have access to college guest house.

2. (06) Retired faculty are charged as regular faculty for athletic events.

3. (06) Retired faculty are given preference for part-time teaching jobs.

4. (06) Retired faculty may be listed on the campus speaker roster.

Second Least Desirable:

1. (06) Retired faculty are invited to participate in commencements.

2. (06) Same as # 1 under First Least Desirable.

Third Least Desirable:

1. (09) Retired faculty have their center on campus.

2. (06) Retired faculty have access to college guest house.

3. (06) Retired faculty get regular faculty discounts at the bookstore.

A review of the expressions of desirability and of undesirability by AAU respondents with reference to the list of 48 potential perquisites suggest the following:

First, there are no items that a majority of institutional representatives found objectionable for their university and its retired faculty. In fact, even when the data for the first, second and third least desirable are merged, the result seems to reflect only small minority views.

Second, what was said about the "least desirable" items above is equally true about those identified by respondents as "most desirable" items.

Third, the impressions of respondents about desirable and undesirable items was quite mixed. For example, 14 of the 48 items were listed as desirable by some and as not desirable by others. In fact, only six of the 48 items were not on someone's list as either desirable or undesirable.

It should be noted, too, that the notion of an item being undesirable is certainly open to more than one interpretation. Some respondents may have meant that the university might be uncomfortable with, while others might have been expressing the opinion that neither the institution or the retirees would want the item very much even if it were available.

In general, however, there seem, from what the persons who answered said, to be no broadly and strongly held views about the appropriateness of any of the 48 rights and privileges derived from Albert's 1986 "Bill of Rights for Emeriti", whether they are considered for emeriti only or faculty retirees as a group.

Summary and Concluding Discussion

This investigation was motivated mainly by the lack of published information about the nature of the rights and privileges higher education institutions grant retired faculty. Such information has been more and more in the news as it regards retirees from the private sector, business and commercial enterprises, and, there, it has bearing on how and when the individual elects to retire. Anecdotal evidence (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990) suggests that the perquisites that may accompany retirement in higher education could very well also influence the timing of retirement. So it seemed timely to learn what policies and practices, if any, were currently in effect regarding rights and privileges connected with retirement in higher education.

A series of studies was projected, of which this is the first. It was decided to begin with queries to some of the major research universities, partly because what little literature there is on the matter has come from authors associated with larger and well-known schools. For the purpose of this study, the membership (60) of the AAU was chosen.

The 78% response encouraged us to feel that we had obtained a fair representation of large, well-regarded universities. All of the respondents requested summaries of our findings.

It did prove possible to answer the five questions posed in the investigation. The validity of Albert's 1986 list of rights and privileges was bolstered by the findings that every item on the list is provided retirees by some universities, and that 27% (13 of 48) are provided by more than half of the institutions in the population queried. It seems clear, though, despite the above facts, that Albert's list is not yet viewed as a "Bill of Rights" in its entirety by the institutions sampled. Moreover, there may very well be additional rights and privileges recognized by universities but not included in our checklist. We did not ask about that because our questionnaire was already very lengthy.

Seven relatively distinct policy statements could be inferred or induced from the long list of individual rights and privileges. Each of the seven seems different enough, substantively, from the others to represent one form of policy. One or more of the seven might be in effect at any given institution. We have not yet explored that matter at the university policy statement level and the returns from our inquiry did not provide us with the means to do so. We do suggest that the kinds of general statements we have developed, however, may prove useful for faculty and institutional planning and negotiation.

It is plain, from other reports, that many higher education institutions make rather marked distinctions between faculty retirees in general and those retirees who are designated "emeritus" (Mauch, Birch and Matthews, 1990). Our question was whether that distinction in title was paralleled by some distinctions in rights and privileges conferred at the time of retirement. Some differentiations were found. The rights and privileges reserved for emeriti seemed to trend in the direction of more encouragement for the emeriti to maintain a presence in the academic/professional departmental community. Also, the more frequent association of emeritus status and telephone, mailing and secretarial privileges perhaps has significance for the continuation, after formal retirement, of the kinds of research and scholarly work that prompted the awarding of emeritus rank to begin with.

A fourth matter of interest was whether some universities provided rights and privileges to retirees to a substantially greater degree than did others. Without question, there are major differences among AAU member schools as to whether they offer many or few perquisites, and whether the perquisites go to all faculty or to emeriti only. Perhaps more important, though, are these facts: About six out of ten major research universities distinguish faculty retirees in general from those who retire with the emeritus rank by awarding significantly more perquisites to the later. The average number of perquisites given to faculty retirees by such universities is 22, or almost half the number in Albert's "Bill of Rights for Emeriti"(1986).

The last question examined in this effort to gather data on retiree perquisites and privileges dealt with the views of respondents as to the relative desirability or undesirability of the list of items Albert had developed and published in 1986. One thing we had anticipated was that those perquisites and privileges with substantial costs attached might very well show up high in the "undesirable" category. Actually, that was not the case. Expense to the institution seemed to play little or no part in picking out the items respondents rated undesirable. On the contrary, two of the perquisites and privileges chosen as most desirable by the respondents called for the institution to bear some or all of the cost of retiree health and life insurance. A third item ranked as second most desirable would allow retired faculty to receive and administer grants and contracts for research and scholarly work. In spite of overhead allowances in such fund awards, most institutions hold that their costs are far from fully recovered. So in the instance just noted, our hunch about the possible deterring effect of institutional costs was not born out by the facts.

Probably the most significant finding revealed in the responses to this last question is the absence of any firm consensus among the institutional representatives who made the ratings as to which items should be classed as more or less desirable. At least at the time the survey was made, no strong feeling one way or the other seemed to be held by any large proportion of the universities questioned. That suggests, perhaps, that many major and well-regarded higher education centers are not at all committed to any one position on the "Bill of Rights for Emeriti" concept and are keeping open minds as to what, if any, policy positions to move to next.

REFERENCES

AAUP. (1988). Statement on principles on academic retirement and insurance plans." *Academe*, 74, pp. 37-38.

Albert, S. P. (1986). Retirement: From rite to rights. *Academe*, 72, pp. 24-26.

Mauch, J.; Birch, J. W.; & Matthews, J. (1990). *The emeritus professor: Old rank-new meaning*. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

ENDNOTE

1. Printouts of the entire set of responses are available as long as the supply lasts by addressing a request to Dr. James E. Mauch, one of the authors, at 5-S-34 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15260